REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 07, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 22-30. By this paper, the Applicants add new claims 31-42, for clarification of certain features to expedite allowance of the present application. These amendments do not add any new matter. Upon entry of these amendments, claims 22-42 remain pending in the present application and are believed to be in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Avery (U.S. Patent No. 4,476,249, hereinafter Avery) in view of Wolf (PCT Application number WO 01/38456, hereinafter Wolf). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these rejections in light of following remarks.

The cited references, taken alone or in hypothetical combination, fail to teach or suggest features recited by independent claim 22.

Turning to the claims, the present independent claim 22 recites, *inter alia*, "an energy generating system for generating energy from an intermittent renewable energy source"

First, the cited references, taken alone or in hypothetical combination, fail to teach or suggest "*intermittent* renewable energy source," as recited by independent claim 22. Primary reference, Avery discloses use of Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion (OTEC) for power generation. OTEC, although a renewable energy source, is not intermittent. As identified in paragraph 4, "there is a need in the related art for an effective system to implement a method for maintaining uninterrupted hydrogen-based power production

utilizing intermittent renewable energy sources." One of the important aspects of the present invention is that it enables use of intermittent renewable energy sources but maintains uninterrupted power output, *see* paragraph 16. Paragraph 12 describes such intermittent renewable energy sources like wind, solar and tidal energy.

OTEC system is described in Avery at column 2, lines 37-41, as "The OTEC plantships comprise energy producing systems which exploit the difference in temperature between the surface and deep ocean waters to run a Rankine engine or the equivalent and thereby generate electric power." It is well known that this temperature difference is not cyclic or intermittent like other renewable energy sources mentioned above. Even Wolf does not describe the intermittency aspects in either abstract or Fig. 1.

Thus neither Avery nor Wolf describe or suggest intermittent renewable energy source, and hence their hypothetical combination cannot suggest this aspect, which is one of the important aspects of current invention.

Second, Avery and Wolf both describe use of hydrogen to make chemicals like methanol. Applicants would like to point out that in the present invention, hydrogen produced in production system is sent to at least one of power generation plant or hydrogen storage (*see* paragraph 5). Both Avery and Wolf do not describe either a power generation plant based on hydrogen or a hydrogen storage system, and hence cannot suggest the current invention.

Third, Avery does not describe a gasification system which is configured to channel at least a portion of synthesis gas generated to power generation system as described in Claim 22. In Avery, the synthesis gas produced goes to a catalytic converter for methanol.

For at least these reasons among others, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for independent claim 22 and all claims dependent thereon.

Avery does not teach all elements of current invention.

With respect to claim 26, the examiner has likened the tidal energy described in present invention with "ocean thermal energy conversion," OTEC, described in Avery. Applicants would like to highlight that though both of these are renewable energies obtained from oceans, the principle of operation in both of these is quite different. Tidal energy is based on mechanical movements caused due to oceanic tides. OTEC on the other hand, uses the temperature difference between the surface and deep ocean water to run a Rankine cycle there between, *see* Avery, column 2, lines 37-41.

Thus the Applicants submit that the two are quite different and OTEC cannot anticipate use of tidal energy as suggested by the Examiner. Hence Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Invention must be considered as a whole

The Applicants would like to point out that for a 103 (a) rejection, the "claimed invention must be considered as a whole. *See* MPEP 2141 (II) BASIC

CONSIDERATIONS WHICH APPLY TO OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS. Thus dependent claims 23-30 should be read in light of claim 22 from which it depends.

Since claim 22 has already been shown to be patentably distinct, all dependent claims therefrom, also inherit limitations and distinctions of claim 22. Hence the Applicants would like to request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections for claims 23-30.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims should be in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner believes certain amendments are necessary to clarify the present claims or if the Examiner wishes to resolve any other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick K. Patnode/
Patrick K. Patnode
Registration No. 40,121
General Electric Company
Building K1, Room 3A52a
1 Research Circle, Niskayuna, NY 12309
(518) 387-5286
June 7, 2007